

DEPARTMENT • OF • WATER • RESOURCES  
**CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN**  
♦ UPDATE 2005 ♦

**SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP COMMENTS**  
**SAN LUIS OBISPO, CA**

<i>Date:</i>	<b>June 29, 2005</b> 1:00 – 5:00 pm	<i>Location:</i>	<b>San Luis Obispo</b> Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board 895 Aerovista Place
<i>Meeting Purpose and Goals:</i>	To hear and record public comment on the Public Review Draft of the California Water Plan Update 2005		
All meeting materials, including the PowerPoint presentation, are available at the California Water Plan website at: <a href="http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm">http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm</a>			

Presenters:

**Mary Ann Dickinson**, Advisory Committee member, California Urban Water Conservation Council  
**Kamyar Guivetchi**, Manager, Statewide Water Planning, CA Department of Water Resources (DWR)  
**Paula Landis**, District Chief, San Joaquin District, DWR  
**Julia Lee**, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy, CA State University, Sacramento

**Introduction: Format and Purpose**

Julia Lee, meeting facilitator, introduced the presenters and DWR staff and welcomed everyone to the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Public Input Workshop. She thanked the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board for providing the meeting facility. The purpose of the meeting was for the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR) to receive public input and to share ideas for the Public Review Draft of the CA Water Plan.

The workshop format was interactive. The meeting consisted of 3 presentations by Kamyar Guivetchi (DWR), each followed by group discussion. Advisory Committee member Mary Ann Dickinson spoke on behalf of the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Advisory Committee, and DWR San Joaquin District Chief Paula Landis summarized the Central Coast Regional Report, which are located in Volume 3 of the CA Water Plan. DWR staff helped record the group discussion on a flipchart. The group chose a reporter among themselves who would summarize the group discussion to the entire audience on behalf of the group. Near the end of the meeting, time was reserved for a traditional spoken comment period where individuals to orally present prepared statements. For detailed description of the format, see the “Working in Groups” handout.

**Part 1 – Agenda Items A and B**

**A) Background & Overview / B) Comments from the Advisory Committee**

This *Water Plan Update* is different than previous updates. It was prepared using a new process. There are many new features in the Water Plan. It will be continually updated as new information becomes available, and it presents a strategic plan and framework for action developed with substantial

stakeholder input. Kamyar Guivetchi spoke on the content and strategic planning process used in the Water Plan. Advisory Committee member Mary Ann Dickinson explained the *Advisory Committee View*, a 4-page handout prepared by the Advisory Committee that summarizes the areas of agreement and points of disagreement among the 65-member Advisory Committee over the last four and a half years, and uncertainties remaining in the Water Plan.

Below is a summary of the comments made at the table:

*Thinking about the presentation on Background and Overview by DWR and Comments from the Advisory Committee, what are the things you:*

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Liked the process of creating the Water Plan – more comprehensive and more chances to review.</li> <li>+ Liked the collaboration between state government and local agencies/groups – that is the only way to go.</li> <li>+ Liked facilitation services.</li> <li>+ Liked diversity of Advisory Committee.</li> <li>+ Liked using improved technology (CDs, e-mail, and websites)</li> <li>+ Liked the enormous amount of information and data available to us.</li> </ul> <p><b>Individual Comment forms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ The Water Plan is overwhelming – a lot of info.</li> <li>+ Structure of process is different from past plans.</li> <li>+ Liked being “in the loop.”</li> <li>+ Liked collaborative process.</li> </ul>	<p>Δ Group consensus: Add a separate Initiative in the Framework for Action that is focused on conservation.</p> <p><b>Individual Comment Forms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreach to local agencies – newspaper notice of workshop.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More local city/county representatives should have attended this public input workshop.</li> </ul> <p><b>Individual Comment Forms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How were Advisory Committee members chosen?</li> <li>• Do we know where future plans will go?</li> <li>• Will the process of future Water Plans be the same?</li> <li>• Public outreach – why so few attendees?</li> </ul>

## Part 2 – Agenda Items C and D

### C) California Water Today & Water Balance / D) Regional Reports

It is important for a strategic plan to have a clear description of current conditions and situations. Chapter 3 of Volume 1: Strategic Plan is called “California Water Today.” As the largest chapter in Volume 1 (about 120 pages), it is intended to provide education and reference information. It gives general findings from both statewide and regional perspectives as well as the perspectives of different water use sectors (agriculture, urban, and environment). Volume 3 of the Water Plan has more detailed information on each of the 10 hydrologic regions (plus additional reports for Statewide, San Luis Obispo Workshop Comments – June 29, 2005

Mountain Counties, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta), covering conditions, challenges, accomplishments, and future opportunities of the Region presented, as well as quantified water balances for supply and use. Kamyar Guivetchi presented the California Water today and statewide water balances, and San Joaquin District Chief Paula Landis presented the Volume 3 regional reports for the Central Coast.

Thinking about the description of California Water Today and the Regional Reports, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Liked coverage of global climate change and its potential impacts in CA</li> <li>+ Liked how Water Plan reports on regional differences within CA.</li> </ul> <p><b>Individual Comment Forms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ Keep broad discussion of global warming.</li> <li>+ Good discussion of water quality.</li> <li>+ Good analysis of agricultural water use. Liked 3 years of water portfolios.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Δ Discuss discharge to the ocean.</li> <li>Δ Discuss more agricultural water reuse.</li> <li>Δ There is too much emphasis on the Mountain Counties.</li> <li>Δ There is lack of information on San Luis Obispo County and Santa Barbara County in the Central Coast Regional Report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Santa Maria Flood Management</li> <li>○ Paso Robles Templeton Water Basin Model</li> <li>○ Santa Barbara County Groundwater Study of 2004</li> <li>○ South Coast of Santa Barbara major water sources</li> <li>○ Goleta groundwater adjudication</li> </ul> </li> <li>Δ Make data available in more detail so that it can be used for developing regional plans.</li> <li>Δ There is a lot of water in the Central Coast that drains into the ocean without recyclable value that this point, should be addressed.</li> <li>Δ More emphasis on conservation for the local Central Coast area.</li> <li>Δ Would like Water Portfolios of several dry years, or of a year that follows several dry years. They would have different statistics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that interagency conflicts are affecting flood control.</li> <li>• Are rainwater cisterns discussed?</li> <li>• Is southern Santa Barbara County planning and water supply discussed in the Central Coast Regional Report?</li> </ul> <p><b>Individual Comment Forms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More emphasis on water recycling – especially agriculture.</li> </ul>

### Part 3 – Agenda Items E and F

#### E) Preparing for the Future (Scenarios) / F) Diversifying Responses (Strategies)

This *Water Plan Update 2005* recognizes that many things may alter water use and supplies between now and 2030. For that reason, the *Update* contains a description of three plausible yet different future scenarios. Uncertainty about future course of events creates a need for multiple options to address opportunities and challenges. Further, the Plan recognizes that one size does not fit all regions of the state. Each region will have specific requirements or needs that may not apply across the entire state. Implementing multiple options (diverse management strategies) allows water planners and managers to adapt to a variety of circumstances. Volume 2 (Resource Management Strategies) has narrative descriptions for 25 different management strategies available to help them reduce water demand, improve operational efficiency and transfers, increase water supply, improve water quality, and practice resource stewardship.

Below is a summary of the comments made by individuals in response to these questions:

*Thinking from the perspective of 2030 are there things about this approach to plan for the future you:*

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>+ Liked 3 different, contrasting years.</p>	<p>Δ Discuss the state law mandating water conservation.</p> <p>Δ Study multiple dry years, the 7-year drought.</p> <p>Δ Scenario assumptions should use regulatory/economic incentives for increasing agricultural/urban water use efficiency.</p> <p>Δ Indicate that the costs for implementing resource management strategies will vary by region.</p> <p>Δ Need more information on cost of management strategies.</p> <p><b>Individual Comment Forms:</b></p> <p>Δ Include issues of Mexico's water quality.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>County information is lacking; drought year information is useful for regional planners.</li> <li>Where is Bulletin 118 (CA's Groundwater) data?</li> <li>Is there a discussion of groundwater adjudication in basins? Goleta?</li> <li>What factors other than agricultural water use efficiency go into the scenarios?</li> <li>Should there be more agricultural and urban water use efficiency for the Less Resource Intensive scenario?</li> <li>Water marketing should not discourage farming.</li> </ul> <p><b>Individual Comment Forms:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there other factors in agricultural water use efficiency.</li> <li>What is water reuse potential in agricultural.</li> </ul>

#### **Part 4 Additional Public Comments**

##### **Public Outreach Ideas**

- Mail to agencies
- E-mail to agencies
- Newspapers
- Public service announcements
- PBS radio and television
- Send notices to every County Board of Supervisors

#### **Part 5 – Formal Public Comments** (in order of presentation):

Members of the public were welcome to present statements in the formal style of a traditional public hearing. No members of the public registered to speak.

#### **Part 6 – Closing**

Kamyar and Julia thanked the audience for participating in the public comment workshop and for their comments. He reminded everyone that the public review period will last through July 22, to allow for 60 days since the release of the printed Public Review Draft document.

The final comment deadline is July 22.

#### **Attendance:**

##### **Public:**

Marguerite Bader, League of Women Voters of San Luis Obispo County  
Jackie Crabb, San Luis Obispo County Farm Bureau  
Mary Ann Dickinson, California Urban Water Conservation Council  
Mark Hutchinson, San Luis Obispo Public Works  
Marilee Hyman, League of Women Voters of San Luis Obispo County  
Amy Jewel, UCSB – Bren School  
Joan Kerns, League of Women Voters of Santa Barbara  
Marc Merritte, Los Osos Community Services District  
Linda Phillips, League of Women Voters of Santa Barbara

##### **Staff:**

Paul Dabbs, DWR  
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR  
Paula Landis, DWR  
Julia Lee, CCP  
San Luis Obispo Workshop Comments – June 29, 2005

Mike McGinnis, DWR  
Chris Montoya, DWR  
Neil Rambo, DWR  
David Scruggs, DWR  
David Sumi, CCP